UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
30th meeting
held on
Friday, 19 November 1993
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIRST PART* OF THE 30th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF ALL DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

* The summary record of the second part of the meeting to be reconvened on Friday, 19 November 1993, at 3 p.m., appears as document A/C.1/48/SR.30/Add.1.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.30
13 January 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

93-82534 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF ALL DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.25

1. Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the non-aligned countries, said that although nuclear weapons had added a frightening dimension to the potential for world catastrophe, the major powers had shown callous disregard for the global consequences of their use, which would threaten the very survival of nations.

2. Since a legally binding international instrument had never been ratified, existing arsenals continued to pose a threat to mankind. The possibility that nuclear weapons might be used as an expression of a political decision was frightening, and disaster caused by technical malfunction, misinformation or human error was an ever-present concern. The current situation could not continue, and the question of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons had acquired increasing urgency in multilateral negotiations. The fact that the legal implications of nuclear weapons had yet to be addressed had prompted the non-aligned countries to submit draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.25.

3. However, they recognized that recent developments in the sphere of disarmament made the attainment of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons a more likely prospect. The progress achieved under the auspices of the Amendment Conference and the Conference on Disarmament had, moreover, facilitated the adoption by the Committee of consensus resolutions on a comprehensive test-ban and a ban on the production of fissionable materials which might lead to renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons. To preserve the momentum of the progress being made, the non-aligned countries had therefore decided not to press for final action on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.25 but would continue instead to monitor developments in different forums, with particular interest in the early conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty (CTBT).

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.41

4. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.41 was adopted without a vote.

5. Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. MADDEN (United States of America), noted that comment on paragraph 6 of the resolution just adopted contained a request for additional support services for negotiations on the resolution. He recognized that the Conference on Disarmament would have a heavy workload during its 1994 session, but in view of the financial constraints facing the United Nations, he hoped all additional costs of any tasks of the Conference should be met by redeployment of existing resources.

6. Mr. BANDURA (Ukraine) said that his Government intended to obtain full status in the Conference on Disarmament, and his delegation welcomed the inclusion in the resolution of provision for expanded membership. The decision taken by the Conference on Disarmament to give its Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test-Ban a mandate to negotiate a CTBT necessitated the inclusion of States capable of making constructive contributions. His delegation supported paragraph 6, since additional resources would be required to meet the costs of the Conference's future expanded membership.

7. Mr. SVOBODA (Czech Republic) said his delegation's co-sponsorship of the draft resolution was the expression of its interest in the activities of the Conference on Disarmament and extension of its membership.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.40

8. Mr. SVOBODA (Czech Republic), speaking in explanation of position, said that on 5 October 1993, the seismological stations in the Czech Republic had recorded a Chinese underground nuclear test equivalent to an earthquake of 5.8 on the Richter scale. It was unfortunate that explosions of that magnitude were continuing, and a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty was long overdue. The international community would appreciate moderation with regard to the conduct of tests, and an early start on CTBT negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. Czech experts would continue to participate in the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Cooperative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events. Though only an observer to the Conference on Disarmament, the Czech Republic intended to contribute its seismological know-how to the global cooperative effort to ensure reliable detection of tests. His Government supported efforts towards a treaty banning nuclear weapons, and felt that the Conference's Committee on a Nuclear Test-Ban would be able to achieve substantive progress in 1994.

9. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.40 was adopted without a vote.

10. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia), speaking in explanation of position, said that the consensus decision just taken was historic for two reasons: it was the culmination of years of work, and it reflected a series of nuclear arms reduction and nuclear testing initiatives by France, the Russian Federation and the United States. The process had required political commitment, foresight and courage.

11. When he had introduced the resolution on 8 November 1993, more than 100 Member States had been sponsors of the resolution, and that had indicated broad commitment to a ban on nuclear testing. The number of sponsors had since risen to 156, a figure which was unprecedented in the history of the First Committee, or the General Assembly and showed that the atmosphere for successful negotiations on a CTBT had never been more propitious.

12. Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom) said that he welcomed the decision of the Conference on Disarmament to give its Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban a mandate to negotiate a CTBT. He also realized that the complexity of some of the issues might necessitate intersessional meetings. However, since support services had been provided during the negotiations on the 1992 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction without additional services like those requested in the resolution just passed, his delegation did not understand the need for two more staff members as proposed in the programme budget implications statement. Given the financial situation of the United Nations, he hoped that any additional costs would be met by redeployment of existing resources.

13. Mr. HOU Zhitong (China) said that his Government was prepared to work with other countries on a CTBT, and had accordingly supported the consensus adoption of the draft resolution.

14. Nuclear disarmament and a nuclear test ban were, however, principally the responsibility of those countries with the largest nuclear arsenals. China believed that negotiations on the issue of non-first-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States should also be conducted, and international agreements on the subject concluded. His Government would play an active role in the CTBT negotiations.

15. Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia) said that the Member States of the Non-Aligned Movement Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons welcomed the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.40. It was the first time that the United Nations had reached consensus on the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. He hoped that the Conference on Disarmament would conclude such a treaty before the end of the 1994 session, since that would influence the outcome of the 1995 review and extension conference of the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

16. Mr. LAVINA (Philippines) concurred with the statements of the representatives of Australia, Indonesia and the Czech Republic.

17. Mr. HAN Toe Song (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his Government had consistently supported the ban on tests, production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons and that it welcomed the decision of the Disarmament Conference to give its Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban a mandate to negotiate a universal verifiable treaty as one of the most effective ways to achieve nuclear disarmament.

18. None the less, practical measures on the part of all nuclear-weapons States were even more important than a ban. If those States eliminated their nuclear weapons on a step-by-step basis, that would assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of such weapons. For that reason, his Government wished to raise the issue of nuclear weapons deployed in foreign countries. His delegation had supported the resolution just adopted, in the hope that it would contribute to the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

19. Mr. BATIOUK (Ukraine) informed the Committee that on 18 November 1993 the Ukrainian Parliament, in a historic action, had ratified the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START I) and the Lisbon Protocol by an overwhelming majority. During the debate members of the Parliament had expressed concern on a number of points, including the need to retain a deterrence capability at a time when the security and territorial integrity of Ukraine were under threat and the need to ensure environmental security during the process of reducing nuclear weapon stockpiles. Some members of Parliament had expressed regret that the promises of outside financial assistance in meeting the costs involved in the destruction of nuclear weapons were incommensurable with the needs, and that security assurances had not been given to Ukraine; concern had also been expressed regarding the environmental safety of the situation with regard to the thousands of nuclear weapons transported to the Russian Federation in 1992. A number of reservations had therefore been incorporated into the resolution ratifying the two agreements. Nevertheless, the action taken was a first step by Ukraine. After reading out the text of the resolution, including the reservations, he expressed the hope that other nuclear-weapon States would join the Russian Federation and Ukraine in reducing the number of their nuclear weapons.

20. The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope, on behalf of the Committee, that the action just announced was a first step by Ukraine towards accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

21. Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation) said it was the firm position of the Russian Federation that treaties must be implemented in full and that partial or selective implementation was totally impermissible.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.19

22. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.19 was adopted without a vote.

23. Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had been happy to join the consensus on the draft resolution. A carefully prepared and well-drafted treaty on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, if acceptable to all States in the region, would be an important contribution to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to international peace and security. Given the difficult financial climate facing the United Nations, his delegation had been pleased to note from the statement of programme budget implications that the additional cost of the meetings involved was to be met by redeployment of existing resources.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.6

24. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

25. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.6 was adopted by 141 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

26. Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom), explaining his delegation's abstention in the vote on the draft resolution, said that the United Kingdom strongly supported regional confidence-building measures in principle and also firmly supported regional initiatives such as the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa. However, it was its view that the costs associated with the implementation of the draft resolution should be borne by the participants in the programme, supplemented if necessary by voluntary contributions, and that recourse should not be had to the United Nations regular budget. Additionally, it noted that the call for two meetings to be held in Brazzaville and Luanda in 1994, for which an exception would have to be made to the Headquarters principle, was inconsistent with General Assembly resolution 40/243. No problem would arise, of course, if the costs of the meetings were borne, as they should be, by participants or by voluntary contributions.

27. Mr. MADDEN (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the concept of regional confidence-building measures and was pleased to see such an initiative undertaken by the African States. When the corresponding draft resolution had been submitted to the First Committee in 1991, the United States had been informed that all future costs would be borne by the participants themselves or through voluntary contributions and, on that understanding, had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. It had been disappointed to learn, in 1992, that, contrary to what had been promised, funds would be sought from the United Nations regular budget to cover the costs of the Standing Advisory Committee, and had voted against the draft resolution submitted in

(Mr. Madden, United States)

1992 because of the recurrent, increasing and significant budgetary implications.

28. The United States had been hopeful that the current year's draft resolution would reflect the original intention of the sponsors to have the Standing Advisory Committee funded through voluntary contributions and regional arrangements. That was not the case, and therefore the United States had voted against the draft resolution on financial grounds. If, in the future, funding could be achieved outside of the regular United Nations budget, the United States would again be happy to support the draft resolution.

29. Mr. ONAGA (Gabon), speaking on behalf of the members of the Economic Community of Central African States, thanked the delegations which had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Its sponsors understood the concern of some States, in a time of budgetary constraint for the United Nations, not to incur additional financial obligations, and interpreted their votes not as a rejection of the substance of the draft resolution but as a desire to save money for the Organization. However, the sponsors of the draft resolution shared the views expressed on the importance of regional disarmament measures by the representatives of Canada and Pakistan during the Committee's consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28, and would remind the Committee that in proposing the draft resolution just voted on, its sponsors had intended to emphasize their determination to promote disarmament and non-proliferation in the subregion of Central Africa as well as to affirm the value of preventive diplomacy.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1

30. Ms. MASON (Canada) said that the draft resolution's sponsors had considered the amendment proposed by India (A/C.1/48/L.54) and had agreed to delete the words "at the global, regional and local levels" in the third preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 2 (a).

31. Mr. KUMAR (India) said that as his delegation's amendment had been partially accepted, it had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1.

32. Mr. MADDEN (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation intended to abstain. While the United States did not dispute the importance of verification in arms control and disarmament, particularly for the negotiation and implementation of the relevant agreements, it objected to the in-depth study on verification proposed in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution on a number of grounds. First, the launching of a new study before the results of the 1990 study had been properly evaluated seemed premature. Furthermore, only two replies had been received in the light of General Assembly resolution 47/45, which hardly indicated enthusiastic support for the proposed study. Second, the proposed examination of the results of recent United Nations experience on verification was unacceptable, particularly in the case of the Special Commission on Iraq, which, in the view of his delegation, was at a critical stage of its work. The United States also questioned the advisability of launching a United Nations study that might entail a review of Security Council actions. Third, in view of the

(Mr. Madden, United States)

current budgetary constraints, and the increasing financial burden of expanded peacemaking peace-keeping operations, any unnecessary expense should be avoided. Lastly, he wondered who would be providing the proposed group of experts with lessons on recent United Nations experience in verification and other international developments. More important, the actual relevance of experience gained in one very specific field, such as the work of the Special Commission on Iraq, in the broader context of arms control and other United Nations activities was questionable. In any case, the results of the work of that Commission should in the first instance be evaluated by the body itself.

33. Mr. PERRI (Brazil), expressing support for the draft resolution, said that since the completion of the study on the role of the United Nations in the field of verification in 1990 a number of significant events, including the conclusion of the Chemical Weapons Convention and the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Governmental Experts to Identify and Examine Possible Verification Measures from a Scientific and Technical Standpoint (the VEREX process), had highlighted the importance of verification and pointed to the need for a new and comprehensive study on the subject. He therefore applauded the initiative taken by the delegation of Canada and hoped that the draft resolution would receive the broad support of the international community.

34. Mr. GUILLAUME (Belgium) said that the 12 member States of the European Union intended to abstain from the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1. He stressed the importance the Twelve attached to all aspects of verification as a means of ensuring international peace and security through mutual trust and compliance with international agreements on arms control and disarmament. However, as only three years had elapsed since the completion of the last United Nations study on verification, it seemed premature to entrust a group of experts with new tasks, which would not only have financial implications but also entail an additional burden for the Secretariat. As to the scope of the proposed study, it was premature to draw conclusions on the verification aspects of disarmament agreements and activities under way such as those of the Special Commission on Iraq. Moreover, it was inappropriate to deal with verification matters in the abstract, without taking due account of specific treaties and regimes or appropriate forums already in existence. Lastly, with regard to the prevention of conflict and handling of crises, the increasingly important role of regional arrangements must not be overlooked.

35. Ms. MASON (Canada), responding to the comments made, recalled that when introducing the draft resolution she had explained in detail why a new study on verification had been deemed timely. She failed to understand how it could be considered premature to update a study which had been carried out during, and largely based on the needs of, the cold war era. Of the three replies that had been received in connection with the follow-up to that study, one had been on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community.

36. As to the remarks regarding the United Nations Special Commission on Iraq, she reiterated that the purpose of the study was to examine the tools of verification and practical lessons to be drawn and not the circumstances under which arms control obligations to be verified had come into effect. The Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs had himself observed that recent United

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

Nations experience, in particular that of the Special Commission, could provide useful input on the methodology of verification and monitoring activities. It was hoped that the proposed study would provide a sound basis for constructive debate in other forums on the role the United Nations had to play in verification matters.

37. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) endorsed the Canadian representative's remarks, and said that in spite of the many efforts made, only modest progress had so far been achieved in strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of verification. While he appreciated the statements made by the representatives of Belgium and the United States, he expressed the hope that all other delegations would lend their full support to the draft resolution.

38. Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation), speaking on a point of order, drew attention to the last sentence of rule 128 of the Rules of Procedure.

39. The CHAIRMAN said that he had allowed the representative of Canada to make her statement, since he had not considered it as an explanation of vote. A separate vote had been requested on paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

40. A separate vote was taken on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1, as orally revised.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Luxembourg, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain.

41. Paragraph 2, as orally revised, was adopted by 120 votes to 7, with 14 abstentions.

42. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against. None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

43. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11

44. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the lengthy consultations held with a view to consolidating the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/48/L.11 and the revised amendment proposed in A/C.1/48/L.50/Rev.1 had proved unsuccessful and that he had therefore suggested a further amendment to the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution in order to obviate the need for a vote.

45. Mr. MEHR (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that it had not been clear when the Chairman made his suggestion that it constituted an amendment on which action would be subsequently taken.

46. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana), while appreciating the efforts to facilitate the work of the Committee made by the Chairman, said that it was not appropriate for him to make formal proposals before the Committee, which was the prerogative of representatives.

47. The CHAIRMAN said he believed he had clearly indicated that his suggestion was intended to facilitate the work of the Committee by ensuring the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

48. Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands) commended the initiative of the Chairman, which judging from the informal consultations held, seemed to meet with the approval of the majority of delegations. On the basis of the Chairman's suggestion, he proposed the insertion of the words "in accordance with article 11 of the Convention" at the end of the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11, and further requested that his proposal should be put to the vote forthwith.

49. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) said it was clear that the Chairman's original suggestion would not achieve the desired effect - namely to avoid a vote. He therefore suggested that the Committee should delay no further and either take a decision or prolong consultations on the revised amendment proposed in document A/C.1/48/L.50/Rev.1.

50. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana), referring to rule 130 of the Rules of Procedure, proposed that a vote should first be taken on the revised amendment submitted by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, since it was further removed in substance from the original proposal contained in document A/C.1/48/L.11.

51. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan) said many member countries of the Non-Aligned Movement had sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/48/L.11 in the hope that the First Committee would take a unanimous stance on the crucial issue of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. Many of them, however, also felt that the revised amendment proposed by the Islamic Republic of Iran was consistent with the terms of article 11 of the Chemical Weapons Convention; it was therefore difficult to understand why its insertion in draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11 should have given rise to such problems. Every effort should be made to seek a compromise solution; however, in the event of a vote, his delegation would vote in favour of the revised amendment contained in document A/C.1/48/L.50/Rev.1. He questioned the procedural implications of the representative of the Netherlands proposing an amendment to his own draft resolution without first consulting the other sponsors. It was important, however, not to sacrifice discussion on the substance of the draft resolution to procedural matters.

52. Mr. MEHR (Islamic Republic of Iran) sought clarification regarding the status of the proposal made by the representative of the Netherlands and wondered whether 24 hours should not elapse before any action was taken on it.

53. Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands), noting the need for swift implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention, stressed that he had made his proposal in the interests of security and disarmament. He then sought clarification regarding the order of voting on the amendments proposed.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that the question raised by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran was answered in the third sentence of rule 120 of the rules of procedure. As to the order in which the proposals should be taken up, he was advised by the Legal Counsel that rule 130 of the rules of procedure was applicable; since the amendment in document A/C.1/48/L.50/Rev.1 was further removed from the original draft resolution, it should have priority over the proposal by the representative of the Netherlands.

55. Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands) recalled that at the 25th meeting, the Chairman had made a ruling that the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11 and the amendment in document A/C.1/48/L.50 would be postponed; in a spirit of compromise and flexibility, his delegation had entered into consultations on the wording of the draft resolution. Unfortunately, it had become apparent that the purpose of the amendment was to change the whole basis of the original understanding incorporated in the Convention itself, and that was clearly unacceptable. He therefore wished to inform the Committee that the delegations of Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, as well as his own delegation, would withdraw their sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11 in the eventuality that the Iranian amendment was adopted by the Committee. That would be a major decision, and would reflect the great importance those States had always attached to the Chemical Weapons Convention. The draft resolution was purely procedural in nature; the States in question could not agree to an amendment that was contrary to and incompatible with the provisions of the Chemical Weapons Convention, which had been signed by over 150 States and endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 47/39, adopted by consensus.

56. He proposed that no action should be taken on the amendment in document A/C.1/48/L.50/Rev.1.

57. After a discussion in which Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran), Ms. MASON (Canada) and Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) took part, Ms. MASON (Canada) said that she was in favour of the motion to take no action on the amendment in document A/C.1/48/L.50/Rev.1. Her delegation and the Polish delegation had traditionally introduced the draft resolution on the Chemical Weapons Convention over the many years of negotiations and up to the time when the draft Convention was completed. The Iranian amendment introduced substance into a procedural draft resolution and did not accurately reflect what had been so arduously negotiated in Geneva. Therefore, it could not form a basis for consensus. If the motion for adjournment failed, her delegation and many others would vote against the Iranian amendment and, if that amendment was adopted, against the draft resolution as a whole. That situation could be avoided since there was a basis for consensus in the Netherlands proposal.

58. Mr. ZALESKI (Poland) said that Poland, as one of the leading participants in the negotiations on the Chemical Weapons Convention, supported the motion not to take action on the Iranian amendment. His delegation had serious reservations about that amendment because it introduced substantive elements into a procedural draft resolution and did not accurately reflect the carefully balanced text of article 11 of the Chemical Weapons Convention. Those reservations were shared by a number of the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11. As a result, if the Iranian amendment was adopted, the traditional sponsors of draft resolutions on the Chemical Weapons Convention would be forced to withdraw and would vote against draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11. That situation could be avoided.

59. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation was opposed to the motion to take no action on its amendment. It felt that the draft resolution was substantive and that the eighth preambular paragraph touched upon article 11 of the Chemical Weapons Convention in a selective way, without any reference to the need for the removal of restrictions which lay at the heart of that article. Indeed, the whole draft resolution took a selective approach to the Convention. The language used in the amendment was consistent with the Convention, and had been proposed by some of the Western sponsors of the draft resolution in the course of the failed consultations. His delegation would regard votes against the draft resolution as a whole as votes against the Convention itself.

60. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that his delegation was also opposed to the motion for no action on the amendment. Ghana, a developing country, had no chemical weapons, but it had signed the Chemical Weapons Convention as a demonstration of its support for the idea that such weapons should be removed from the face of the earth and to reassure the group of countries that were trying to impose restrictions on the transfer of technology that it had no intention of developing chemical weapons. The motion for adjournment revealed an intention to perpetuate discrimination in international relations. The purpose of the draft resolution was to encourage a larger number of States to ratify the Convention. The Iranian amendment was important as an assurance by the international community that the adoption of the Convention was not intended to deny access to technology.

61. Mr. GUILLAUME (Brazil), speaking on a point of order, said that his delegation supported the draft resolution and believed that everyone in the Committee supported it. He therefore called on the Chairman, under rule 118 of the rules of procedure, to suspend the meeting so that a last effort could be made to reach consensus on the draft resolution.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that under rule 119 of the rules of procedure, the motion to suspend the meeting had precedence over the motion to take no action on the amendment.

63. The motion to suspend the meeting was adopted by 122 votes to 31.

The meeting was suspended at 1 p.m.